

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

<p>TEAM WORLDWIDE CORPORATION,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ACADEMY, LTD d/b/a ACADEMY SPORTS + OUTDOORS,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</p>	<p>Case No. 2:19-cv-92-JRG-RSP</p> <p>LEAD CASE</p>
<p>ACE HARDWARE CORPORATION,</p> <p>AMAZON.COM, INC, AMAZON.COM LLC,</p> <p>BED BATH &amp; BEYOND INC.,</p> <p>COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION,</p> <p>DICK'S SPORTING GOODS, INC.,</p> <p>THE HOME DEPOT, INC.,</p> <p>MACY'S, INC., MACY'S.COM, LLC,</p> <p>TARGET CORPORATION, and TARGET BRANDS, INC.,</p> <p>SEARS, ROEBUCK AND CO., SEARS HOLDINGS CORPORATION, and TRANSFORM HOLDCO LLC,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</p>	<p>Case No. 2:19-cv-00093-JRG-RSP</p> <p>Case No. 2:19-cv-00094-JRG-RSP</p> <p>Case No. 2:19-cv-00095-JRG-RSP</p> <p>Case No. 2:19-cv-00096-JRG-RSP</p> <p>Case No. 2:19-cv-00097-JRG-RSP</p> <p>Case No. 2:19-cv-00098-JRG-RSP</p> <p>Case No. 2:19-cv-00099-JRG-RSP</p> <p>Case No. 2:19-cv-00100-JRG-RSP</p> <p>Case No. 2:20-cv-00006-JRG-RSP</p> <p>CONSOLIDATED CASES</p>

**DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS TO ORDER ON MOTIONS *IN LIMINE***

Pursuant to Federal Rule 72 and Local Rule CV-72(b), Defendants hereby object to the Magistrate Judge's Order on Motions *in Limine*. (ECF No. 394 ("Order").) Specifically, Defendants object to the rulings regarding Plaintiff's motion *in limine* No. 8 and Defendants' motion *in limine* No. 16.

By granting Plaintiff's motion *in limine* No. 8, the Magistrate Judge excluded reference to the prosecution history, "since disclaimer and estoppel are not jury issues." (Order, at 4.) However, Defendants had intended to use the prosecution histories to show the jury TWW's admissions related to many issues. *See* FED. R. EVID. 801(d)(2)(A), (D); *i4i Ltd. P'ship v. Microsoft Corp.*, 670 F. Supp. 2d 568, 587 (E.D. Tex. 2009), *aff'd as modified*, 589 F.3d 1246 (Fed. Cir. 2009), *opinion withdrawn & superseded on reh'g*, 598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010), 564 U.S. 91 (2011) (discussing prosecution history of patent); *Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.*, 679 F.3d 1372, 1381-82 (Fed. Cir. 2012) ("Mintz's argument [during prosecution] for why [a prior art reference] lacks the 'intersecting in locking engagement' claim limitation applies similarly to explain why [defendant]'s accused products also lack that claim limitation."); *Cook Grp. Inc. v. Boston Sci. Scimed, Inc.*, 809 F. App'x 990, 1000 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 30, 2020) ("It is well established, however, that a statement made by a party in an individual or representative capacity may be offered as evidence against that party."); *cf. Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Rsch. Organisation v. Mediatek Inc.*, No. 6:12-CV-578, 2015 WL 12806515, at \*3 (E.D. Tex. June 29, 2015) ("Defendants' experts may use statements from the prosecution history to support their contention that the accused structure is not equivalent.").

For example, Defendants had intended to use the prosecution histories to show the jury TWW's admissions regarding the application of the claims (using the same constructions adopted by the Court) to prior art. *See, e.g., Nat'l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Canadian Pac. Ry., Ltd.*, 357 F.3d 1319,

1334 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (noting that it is “elementary in patent law” that an invalidity assessment is a two-step process, including (1) construing the claims, and (2) applying that construction to the prior art) (citation omitted). Defendants also intended to use the prosecution histories to show the jury TWW’s admissions regarding facts relevant to the nexus inquiry for secondary considerations. The prosecution history may, likewise, help the jury weigh a testifying expert’s opinion about how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the claimed inventions and whether two references would have been obvious to combine. *See, e.g., McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1339, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (discussing trial evidence of examiner’s consideration of references). Respectfully, if Defendants are precluded from relying on this evidence, either in its affirmative case or in cross-examining TWW’s experts, TWW would have the ability to take factual positions before the jury that are inconsistent with factual positions it took during prosecution, simply because the patentee made an inconsistent statement inside the file history instead of outside of it. Allowing the jury to consider and weigh evidence of such inconsistencies prevents this injustice; therefore, Defendants object to the Magistrate Judge’s ruling regarding Plaintiff’s motion *in limine* No. 8.

Conversely, by denying Defendants’ motion *in limine* No. 16, the Magistrate Judge is allowing TWW to argue claim construction to the jury—specifically, that the asserted claims are limited to “airbeds” instead of “inflatable products.” (Order, at 9.) This is highly prejudicial to Defendants. Indeed, “it is improper to argue claim construction to the jury because the ‘risk of confusing the jury is high[.]’” *Cordis Corp v. Boston Scientific Corp.*, 561 F.3d 1319, 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (citation omitted). Therefore, Defendants object to the Magistrate Judge’s ruling regarding Defendants’ motion *in limine* No. 16.

Dated: May 18, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Reid E. Dodge

Charles Everingham IV  
State Bar No. 00787447  
**WARD SMITH & HILL, PLLC**  
P.O. Box 1231  
Longview, TX 75606-1231  
(903) 757-6400 (telephone)  
(903) 757-2323 (facsimile)  
Email: ce@wsfirm.com

*Counsel for Defendants Ace Hardware Corporation; Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.; Home Depot U.S.A., Inc. and Home Depot Product Authority, LLC; Target Corporation; Sears, Roebuck and Co., and Sears Holdings Corporation; and Transform SR LLC and Transform KM LLC*

**FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

R. Trevor Carter (admitted in E.D. Texas)  
trevor.carter@faegredrinker.com  
Andrew M. McCoy (admitted in E.D. Texas)  
andrew.mccoy@faegredrinker.com  
Reid E. Dodge (admitted in E.D. Texas)  
reid.dodge@faegredrinker.com  
300 N. Meridian St., Suite 2500  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
(317) 237-0300 (telephone)  
(317) 237-1000 (facsimile)

Lauren M.W. Steinhäuser (admitted in E.D. Texas)  
lauren.steinhaeuser@faegredrinker.com  
90 S. Seventh St., Suite 2200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 766-7000 (telephone)

Bethany N. Mihalik (admitted in E.D. Texas)  
bethany.mihalik@faegredrinker.com  
1500 K Street NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202-312-7440

*Counsel for Defendants Academy, Ltd d/b/a Academy Sports + Outdoors; Ace Hardware Corporation; Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.; Home Depot U.S.A., Inc. and Home Depot Product Authority, LLC; Target Corporation; Sears, Roebuck and Co., and Sears Holdings Corporation; and Transform SR LLC and Transform KM LLC*

/s/ John S. Artz

**DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC**

John S. Artz

jsartz@dickinsonwright.com

350 S. Main St., Suite 300

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

(734) 623-7075

Steven A. Caloiaro

scaloiaro@dickinsonwright.com

100 W. Liberty St., Suite 940

Reno, NV 8951

(775) 343-7500

Peter E. Doyle

pdoyle@dickinsonwright.com

2600 W. Big Beaver Rd., Suite 300

Troy, MI 48084-3312

(248) 205-5978

*Counsel for Defendants Academy, Ltd d/b/a Academy Sports + Outdoors and Target Corporation*

/s/ Robert T. Cruzen

Robert T. Cruzen

**KLARQUIST SPARKMAN LLP**

One World Trade Center

121 SW Salmon St., Suite 1600

Portland, OR 97204

*Counsel for Defendants Amazon.com, Inc. and Amazon.com LLC*

/s/ Walter Hill Levie III

John W. Harbin

Gregory J. Carlin

Walter Hill Levie III  
**MEUNIER CARLIN & CURFMAN LLC**  
999 Peachtree St. NE, Suite 1300  
Atlanta, GA 30309

*Counsel for Defendants Bed Bath & Beyond Inc.;  
Costco Wholesale Corporation; Macy's Retail  
Holdings, Inc. and Macy's.com, LLC; Target  
Corporation; and Amazon.com, Inc. and  
Amazon.com LLC*

Michael C. Smith  
State Bar No. 18650410  
Siebman, Forrest, Burg & Smith, LLP  
113 E. Austin St.  
Marshall, TX 75671  
Office: 903-938-8900  
michael.smith@siebman.com

*Counsel for Defendants Academy, Ltd d/b/a  
Academy Sports + Outdoors; Ace Hardware  
Corporation; Amazon.com, Inc. and Amazon.com  
LLC; Bed Bath & Beyond Inc.; Costco Wholesale  
Corporation; Dick's Sporting Goods, Inc.; Macy's  
Retail Holdings, Inc. and Macy's.com, LLC; Home  
Depot U.S.A., Inc. and Home Depot Product  
Authority, LLC; and Target Corporation*

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was filed electronically in compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a). Therefore, this document was served on counsel of record, all of whom have consented to electronic service, on this 18th Day of May, 2021.

/s/ Reid E. Dodge